Ban on showing of film

†*20. SHRI RAM JETHMALANI:
SHRI RAJ MOHINDER SINGH MAJITHA:

Will the Minister of INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that after a strong protest the show of "Jo Bole So Nihal" film had been stopped in a number of States;

(b) if so, the names of such States; and

(c) the reasons for not imposing a ban on showing of this film anticipating a strong protest thereto?

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Though the Central Board of Film Certification (CBFC) does not maintain such information, they have informally ascertained that the film was taken off the screen by the distributors in the States of Punjab, Haryana and Himachal Pradesh on 20.05.2005. After bomb blasts in two theatres in Delhi on 22.05.05, the distributors took off the movie from theatres in the States of Delhi, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, Assam, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu and parts of Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan on 23.05.05.

(c) The film was viewed by a duly constituted Examination Committee and subsequently on the directions of the Punjab and Haryana High Court by a Reviewing Committee. Both the Committees cleared the film for public exhibition with a 'UA' certificate. Further, the Director and Producer of the film informed the Court that they had approached the highest Sikh Body, namely, Akal Takht Sahibji, Amritsar, who had constituted a Committee of six members to view the film on 8th May, 2005. The Committee had not found anything in the movie offending the religious feelings of the Sikhs. In fact, the only recommendation made by the Committee was that it should be clarified in the advertisement of the film that it is not a religious movie. This clarification was incorporated by the producer.

Moreover, as per the Cinematograph Act, 1952, once a film is certified by the Central Board of Film Certification (CBFC) it has no powers to stop

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.

the screening of the film. The revisionary powers of the Central Government under Section 6 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 were struck down by the Supreme Court in their judgement in the Shankarappa Vs. Union of India case in 2000. Therefore, the Central Government does not have any power to intervene or review the decision of the CBFC.

Preservation of art objects

1. SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA: Will the Minister of CULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Comptroller and Auditor General of India has in his Audit Report ending the 31st March, 2004 (no. 4 of 2005) has adversely commented on the lack of any proper standard or norms for acquiring, collecting and preserving art objects in the Indian Museum, Victoria Memorial and Asiatic Society in Kolkata;

(b) if so, the details thereof and Government's reaction thereto;

(c) whether it is also a fact that security system in these institutions is inadequate and leaves much to be desired; and

(d) if so, the steps proposed to be taken to address these shortcomings?

THE MINISTER OF CULTURE (SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY): (a) and (b) Yes, Sir. In Chapter III of C&AG Report No. 4 of 2005 (Civil) for Indian Museum, Asiatic Society and Victoria Memorial Hall, Kolkata the Audit commented on the absence of standards or norms in the four functional areas of acquisition, documentation, preservation/conservation and safe custody of artifacts.

The Indian Museum, Asiatic Society and Victoria Memorial Hall do follow standards norms for acquisition, documentation and conservation/ preservation and safe custody of artifacts. These institutions maintain methodical and scientific standards which are based on the specific needs of the institutions. However, observations made in the Audit Report have been noted for further improvement.

(c) The Audit Report also commented on inadequacy of security systems in these institutions.

(d) According to the recommendations of the Central Advisory Board of